IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Crl.Revision No.156 of 2007(O&M)

DATE OF DECISION: JANUARY 29, 2007

Pawan Kumar and others

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR MITTAL

Present: Mr. N.K.Sanghi, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

...

This criminal revision, which is barred by limitation, has been filed by the accused against the order dated 29.9.2006 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, whereby charges have been framed against them under Sections 120-B, 409 read with Section 120-B IPC, Sections 13(1)(c) and 13(1)(d)(i) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

Counsel for the petitioners contends that the charges have been framed against the petitioners beyond the period of one year, which would certainly cause prejudice to the petitioners. Counsel further contends that in view of Section 219 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, separate charges should have been framed for the offences which alleged to have been committed beyond the period of one year.

I do not find any substance in the aforesaid arguments raised by the counsel for the petitioners. The period mentioned in the charge-sheet, i.e., 1997 to 1999 is the period of posting of the petitioners and during the said posting the alleged offence was committed. They removed

the trees, which had fallen at its own and further cut the standing trees total 5972 in numbers, the value of which was assessed as Rs.28,96,400/-. In view of these facts, in my opinion, the charges have been rightly framed against the petitioners and no prejudice is going to be caused to them.

Dismissed.

January 29, 2007 (SATISH KUMAR MITTAL)
vkg JUDGE